

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/728,684	12/05/2003	Stuart D. Edwards	9222.16953-CON DIV	9057	
26308	7590 10/26/2005		EXAM	INER	
RYAN KROMHOLZ & MANION, S.C. POST OFFICE BOX 26618 MILWAUKEE, WI 53226			PEFFLEY, MICHAEL F		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		3739	3739	
•					

DATE MAILED: 10/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

58

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summany	10/728,684	EDWARDS ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Michael Peffley	3739			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 De</u>	ecember 2003.				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This	2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) □ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the or Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/5/03	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te			

Art Unit: 3739

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the first sentence of the specification should be amended to include the most recent status (i.e. US Patent Number) for the related applications.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 13 lacks proper antecedent basis for "the arm" at line 2. In particular, it is not clear which arm is being referenced since claim 1 recites a basket assembly "including a first arm and a second arm". Clarification is necessary.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Art Unit: 3739

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-14 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,673,070. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the use of a cooling fluid provided through the arms is deemed an obvious treatment modality as is generally well known in the art.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-51 of U.S. Patent No. 6,254,598. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the use of multiple energy delivery devices is deemed to be an obvious consideration for one of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousnesstype double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-88 of U.S. Patent No.
6,056,744. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably
distinct from each other because the use of multiple energy delivery devices is deemed
to be an obvious consideration for one of ordinary skill in the art.

Art Unit: 3739

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Peffley whose telephone number is (571) 272-4770. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 6am-3pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak can be reached on (571) 272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael Petfley Primary Examiner Art Unit 3739

mp October 21, 2005